



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/490,772	01/24/2000	Reinhard Heinrich Hohensee	BLD990043US1	7611

7590

02/26/2004

David W Lynch
Crawford Maunu PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Mendota Heights, MN 55120

EXAMINER

PARK, CHAN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/490,772

Applicant(s)

HOHENSEE ET AL.

Examiner

CHAN S PARK

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 44-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 44-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 May 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-18 and 44-68 in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged.

Drawings

2. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. See Form PTO 948 by the Draftperson.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 13, 14, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Herriot U.S. Patent No. 6,134,583.

3. With respect to claim 13, the Herriot reference teaches a method for managing presentation objects for multiple use, comprising:

Caching an object when downloaded (col. 9, lines 45-53 & col. 10, line 1); and

Capturing the object in memory (col. 21, line 30) if a globally-unique identifier has been assigned to the object (col. 10, lines 32-40; col. 21, lines 21- 37; col. 22, lines 47-64).

4. With respect to claim 14, the Herriot reference further teaches the method of copying the objects in the cache memory to the permanent storage memory in the client computer (col. 21, lines 21-38). The storage memory in the computer is commonly used to retrieve or capture the data element for storing the data permanently.

5. With respect to claim 67, the Herriot reference discloses an article of manufacture comprising a program storage medium readable by a computer, the medium tangibly embodying one or more programs of instructions executable by the computer to perform a method of managing presentation objects for multiple use, the method comprising:

Caching an object when downloaded (col. 9, lines 45-53 & col. 10, line 1); and

Capturing the object in permanent storage (memory) if a globally unique identifier has been assigned to the object (col. 21, lines 21-38). As cited in claim 14, the storage memory in the computer is commonly used to retrieve or capture the data element for storing the data permanently.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 & 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herriot U.S. Patent No. 6,134,583 in view of Myers et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,134,583 (Hereinafter Myers).

6. With respect to claim 1, the Herriot reference teaches a method for enabling re-use of presentation objects by a computer system, comprising:

Identifying an object for presentation (HTML document) by a computer system (col. 10, lines 1-31), and

Assigning a globally-unique identifier to the object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22, lines 47-64).

The Herriot reference, however, does not teach expressly that the presentation objects identified by a globally-unique identifier can be used by a printing system.

The Myers reference, on the other hand, teaches the method for printing accounting data that has been assigned with globally unique transaction identifier by a printing system 16 (col. 6, lines 6-53).

Herriot and Myers are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is the accessing presentation objects identified by a globally unique identifier.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the downloading OID objects of Herriot with the printing presentation objects of Myers.

The suggestion for doing so would have been to provide the user to print downloaded globally unique presentation objects.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Herriot with Myers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

7. With respect to claim 2, the Herriot reference teaches the printing method wherein the globally unique identifier assigned to the object allows the object to be securely and correctly referenced for re-use (col. 1, lines 20-22 & col. 10, lines 32-40).

8. With respect to claim 3, the Herriot reference teaches that the globally-unique identifier assigned to the object is platform independent (col. 10, lines 10-17).

9. With respect to claim 4, the Herriot reference further teaches that the globally-unique identifier is based upon an International Standards Organization administered global naming tree (col. 10, lines 32-67).

10. With respect to claim 5, the Herriot reference further teaches that the globally-unique identifier is contained in a syntax structure of a data stream (col. 9, lines 37-44).

11. With respect to claim 6, Herriot teaches that the document is made up of mixed object data (col. 4, lines 46-56 of Herriot). Therefore, the reference teaches the limitations of the invention as specified in claim 6.

12. With respect to claim 7, the Herriot reference discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the assigning a globally-unique identifier further comprises:

Requesting, in an ISO administered global naming tree, a first node for an application that uses the object (ISO in col. 10, lines 54-56);

Registering, under the first node, a second node for each license of the application ("registration authority" in col. 10, lines 56-58); and

Assigning a globally-unique identifier for the object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22, lines 47-64), the globally-unique identifier including an indication of the object, the first node and the second node (col. 10, lines 41-58).

13. With respect to claim 8, the Herriot reference discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the assigning a globally-unique identifier further comprises generating a globally-unique identifier for an object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22, lines 47-64), the generated globally-unique identifier includes an indication of a first node representing an application that uses the object (ISO in col. 10, lines 54-56), of a second node for each license of the application and of the object ("registration authority" in col. 10, lines 56-58).

14. With respect to claim 9, the Myers reference teaches that the indication of the object includes a time stamp (col. 5, line 1).

15. With respect to claim 10, the Myers reference teaches that the time stamp includes an indication of the date and time (col. 5, line 1).

16. With respect to claim 11, both Herriot and Myers do not explicitly teach the indication of object including a checksum value. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that including a checksum in a data representing the object is well known in the art.

According to the Hansen dictionary, checksum is commonly used to determine the integrity of data that has been received.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to use checksum value described in the dictionary to determine whether the data has been accurately received by the client computer of Herriot.

17. With respect to claim 12, the Herriot reference teaches that the indication of the object includes a binary counter (col. 13, lines 19-33).

18. With respect to claim 44, the Herriot reference discloses a system for managing presentation objects (documents) for multiple use, comprising:

A cache (230) for caching an object when downloaded (col. 20, line 62 – col. 21, line 2); and

Capture storage (memory in col. 30, line 30) for capturing the object if a globally-unique identifier has been assigned to the object (col. 30, lines 26-30 & col. 22, lines 47-64).

The Myers reference, on the other hand, teaches the method for printing accounting data that has been assigned with globally unique transaction identifier by a printing system 16 (col. 6, lines 6-53).

Herriot and Myers are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is the accessing presentation objects identified by a globally unique identifier.

Art Unit: 2622

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the downloading OID objects of Herriot with the printing presentation objects of Myers.

The suggestion for doing so would have been to provide the user to print downloaded globally unique presentation objects.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Herriot with Myers to obtain the invention as specified in claim 44.

Claims 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Herriot and Myers as applied to claim 44 above, and further in view of Boland et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,209,062 (hereinafter Boland).

19. With respect to claims 45 and 46, the combination of Herriot and Myers references teaches all the limitations of claim 44 but it does not explicitly disclose a system that deletes previously captured objects in the printer capture storage and previously downloaded or active objects.

The Boland reference discloses a memory management system that deletes previously captured objects or previously saved objects using a time stamp (col. 3, lines 21-26 & col. 4, lines 13-24) and thus creating available memory for the new data to be stored (col. 2, lines 64-67).

All three references are analogous art since they disclose a memory device.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the memory management system of Boland to the presentation object printing system of Herriot and Myers.

The motivation for doing so would have been to manage the memory capacity for the future data to be saved.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine all three to obtain the invention as specified in claims 45 and 46.

20. With respect to claim 47, the Boland reference discloses that the previously downloaded or active objects exist in cache storage (col. 4, lines 13-24).

21. With respect to claim 48, the Boland reference discloses that the control unit (memory management system) for marking deleted objects in capture storage as removable (LRU pointer in col. 4, lines 30-34).

22. With respect to claim 49, the Boland reference discloses that a removable object is deleted when a capture request is received to make storage available to capture a new resource (col. 2, lines 64-67).

Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Herriot as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Boland et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,209,062 (hereinafter Boland).

23. With respect to claim 15, the Herriot teaches all the limitations of claim 13 but it does not explicitly teach the method of deleting previously captured objects to increase available capture storage area in the memory.

The Boland reference discloses a memory management system that deletes previously captured objects using a time stamp (col. 3, lines 21-26 & col. 4, lines 13-24) and thus creating available memory for the new data to be stored (col. 2, lines 64-67).

Two references are analogous art since they disclose a memory device for storing data.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the memory management system of Boland to the presentation object printing system of Herriot.

The motivation for doing so would have been to manage the memory available capacity for the other receiving data to be saved.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Herriot with Boland to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

24. With respect to claim 16, the Boland reference teaches the method of deleting non-active, least-recently used object first (col. 4, lines 13-24).

25. With respect to claims 17 and 18, two references fail to explicitly disclose method of deleting largest or smallest objects first. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that setting a priority based on the size of the data and deleting based on the priority set by the user is well known in the memory management art. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to set the memory management device delete either largest or smallest based on the user defined parameter to increase the availability of the memory.

Art Unit: 2622

Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Herriot as applied to claim 67 above, and further in view of Boland et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,209,062 (hereinafter Boland).

26. With respect to claim 68, the Herriot teaches all the limitations of claim 67 but it does not explicitly disclose a system that deletes previously captured objects to increase available capture memory.

The Boland reference discloses a memory management system that deletes previously captured objects using a time stamp (col. 3, lines 21-26 & col. 4, lines 13-24) and thus creating available memory for the new data to be stored (col. 2, lines 64-67).

Two references are analogous art since they disclose a memory device for storing data.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the memory management system of Boland to the presentation object printing system of Herriot.

The motivation for doing so would have been to manage the memory capacity for the other receiving data to be saved.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine all three to obtain the invention as specified in claim 68.

Claims 50-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeClair et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,636,891 (hereinafter LeClair) in view of Herriot.

27. With respect to claim 50, the LeClair reference discloses a system for processing referenced object, comprising:

A print server for searching for an object referenced by a selected indicia in a data stream (col. 8, lines 46-47), the selected indicia being a name and an object locator (URL in col. 8, lines 44-45) and a control unit (server controller 405 in fig. 4) for capturing the object (col. 8, lines 53-65). Additionally, the reference discloses the secure communication link between the server and the client (col. 7, lines 63-65). It is also inherent that the object is referenced a certain name since the object is retrieved to the server upon receiving the HTTP GET object request (col. 8, lines 46-47).

LeClair, however, does not disclose expressly that the object is referenced by a globally-unique identifier wherein the control unit determines if the object is to be captured based upon whether the selected indicia includes a globally-unique identifier.

The Herriot reference discloses a server (firewall server 1040 in communication with client 1010 in fig. 10) for searching (requesting) for an object referenced by a selected indicia in a data stream, the selected indicia being a name, a globally-unique identifier or a globally-unique identifier and an object locator (URI & col. 22, lines 17-25) wherein the system determines if the object is to be captured based upon whether the selected indicia include a globally-unique identifier (col. 11, lines 31-38 & col. 21, lines 21-37).

Herriot and LeClair are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is data communication art.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of assigning globally unique identifier to an object of Herriot to the printer server of LeClair since both inventions discloses a secure communication links between the client and the server.

The motivation for doing so would have been to print the globally unique identified objects using print server.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine two references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 50.

28. With respect to claim 51, the LeClair reference discloses that the data stream references the object by an object name and the print server searches for the object by object name (col. 8, lines 46-53). When an HTTP GET object is request, the invention discloses that the data can be retrieved either from the client or the remote storage 622. Thus, it is inherent that the HTTP GET request includes which data streams it must take and the object name in order to retrieve the correct object. Read col. 7, lines 57-65

29. With respect to claim 52, the LeClair reference discloses that the print server attempts to find the object resident in a presentation device (spool 620 in initiator 600) when the object is referenced with an HTTP GET object request (col. 8, lines 47-50). Again, the Herriot reference discloses the method and the system for finding the object resident in a presentation device (cache 230 in client 210) when the object is referenced with a globally unique identifier (col. 21, lines 21-38).

Art Unit: 2622

30. With respect to claim 53, the LeClair reference discloses that the print server downloads the object and the control unit captures the object when the attempt find the resident object fails and the object is referenced from a secure environment (col. 7, lines 57-65 & col. 8, lines 50-53). The reference discloses a secure printing environment by providing the user with a permission to perform the requested operation. Furthermore, the reference discloses method of retrieving the requested data from storage that is not in the resident in a presentation device (remote storage 622).

Additionally, the Herriot reference discloses the method of requesting to various servers in network to retrieve requested object. Thus, when one fails to response, the server has the capability of asking others to retrieve the object (col. 22, lines 23-25 & lines 32-39).

31. With respect to claim 54, the Herriot reference discloses that the server references the object by a globally unique identifier (col. 22, lines 26-39). Note since the request is initially made by the client 1010 and the object data is sent to the client via the server, the server must obtain the copy of object first (col. 22, lines 26-39).

32. With respect to claim 55, the Herriot reference discloses that the server attempts to find object resident in the presentation device using a globally unique identifier (col. 22, lines 33-37). Note that the server first attempts to find objects in the cache and when the cache does not have the object it goes out to network to obtain a new copy (col. 22, lines 37-39).

Art Unit: 2622

33. With respect to claim 56, as noted above in claim 55, the server searches for the resource inline (network) when the search for a resident globally unique identifier fails (col. 22, lines 37-39).

34. With respect to claim 57, the Herriot reference discloses that the server downloads the object (col. 22, lines 23-25) and then stored by the client by globally unique identifier (col. 21, lines 21-37) if the resource is found inline and the object is secure. Note that after the object is found from the various servers in network, the object is first transmitted to the server and then to the client's cache. The client then can save the data to its own memory (col. 21, lines 31).

35. With respect to claim 58, the Herriot reference discloses that the data stream references the object by a globally unique identifier and an object locator (col. 9, lines 33-40).

36. With respect to claim 59, the Herriot reference discloses that the server attempts to find object by searching for a resident globally unique identifier (col. 22, lines 33-37). Note that the server first attempts to find objects in the cache and when the cache does not have the object it goes out to network to obtain a new copy (col. 22, lines 37-39).

37. With respect to claim 60, as noted above in claim 59, the server searches for the resource inline (network) when the search for a resident globally unique identifier fails (col. 22, lines 37-39).

38. With respect to claim 61, the Herriot reference discloses that the server downloads the object (col. 22, lines 23-25) and then stored by the client by globally unique identifier (col. 21, lines 21-37) if the resource is found inline and the object is

Art Unit: 2622

secure. Note that after the object is found from the various servers in network, the object is first transmitted to the server and then to the client's cache. The client then can save the data to its own memory (col. 21, lines 31).

39. With respect to claim 62, the Herriot reference discloses that server looks for the object by object locator (URI or URL) in a resource library when the inline search is unsuccessful (col. 22, lines 23-25 & lines 33-39). Again, the reference discloses the method of searching in various servers using object locator URI or URL. It is commonly known that a resource library is commonly used in the network environment to store data. Thus, one of the various servers can be connected to the resource library for data communication purposes.

40. With respect to claim 63, the Herriot reference discloses that method of determining whether the globally unique identifier assigned to the object matches the globally unique identifier referenced (col. 21, lines 23-25).

41. With respect to claim 64, the Herriot reference discloses that the server downloads the object and the control unit captures the object by the globally unique identifier if the globally unique identifier assigned to the object matches the globally unique identifier referenced (col. 22, lines 17-39).

42. With respect to claim 65, the Herriot reference discloses that an indication of an error is provided if the globally unique identifier assigned to the object does not match the globally unique identifier referenced. Since the object is referenced by the globally unique identifier which guarantees the integrity of the object, it is inherent that when the

object does not match the globally unique identifier referenced, the server does not transmit the object to the client.

43. With respect to claim 66, the Herriot reference discloses that an indication of an error is provided if the object does not contain a globally unique identifier (col. 9, lines 45-57).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S PARK whose telephone number is (703) 305-2448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chan S. Park
February 20, 2004


EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600